



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,194	07/14/2000	Danke Mahesh Bhaskar	TI-28043	3909

7590 04/19/2006
Robert L Troike
Texas Instruments Incorporated
P O Box 655474 MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/616,194		BHASKAR, DANKE MAHESH	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Stephen M. Brinich		2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35

U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 as currently amended recites (lines 6-7) "means for expanding the lookup table above and below said maximum and minimum values of said index and removing initially provided core loop checks". This recitation appears to recite a "means" which does two things: expanding the lookup table and removing initially provided core loop checks.

The present Specification states that "the checks in the core loop are removed" (page 4, lines 5-6; page 8, line 8). However, the present Specification does not describe an

Art Unit: 2625

embodiment that is initially provided with core loop checks and which then removes these core loop checks by some means, as described by the claim language "*means for expanding the lookup table above and below said maximum and minimum values of said index and removing initially provided core loop checks*".

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 5-6 are allowed.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 6, see Response filed 4/11/05 (page 9, lines 1-8, and Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5, see Response filed 9/19/05 (page 5, line 19 - page 6, line 2), have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/3/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (2/3/06 Response: page 4, lines 7-19) that the disclosure states (page 3, line 3) "The core loop of the opcode should have two boundary checks for the index to avoid accessing outside the lookup table area. These checks introduce additional instructions and hence increases the time taken for

Art Unit: 2625

rendering one pixel." and also states (page 4, lines 5-6; page 8, line 8) that "the checks in the core loop are removed".

However, the former recitation refers to a description of a prior art device as "Background of the Invention" and the latter refers to the description of the present invention. Thus, these two recitations do not describe a device in which a core loop check is initially provided and then removed by some means.

Applicant argues (2/3/06 Response: page 4, line 20 - page 5, line 3) that claims 2-4 are allowable for the same reasons as parent claim 1, and also (re claim 2) because claim 2 calls for means for replicating the highest value if the index is above the normal table area.

Arguments of this type describing claim dependency and features are directed to the question of whether the claims define over the prior art, and do not address the outstanding rejection of these claims under 35 USC §112.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center

Art Unit: 2625

2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO

Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.


The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.


Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

smb
April 14, 2006